



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,517	10/31/2000	Timothy A. McDonough	03797.00007	7863
28319	7590	06/13/2006	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF LTD., ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797 1001 G STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597			ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/699,517	MCDONOUGH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Abbas I. Abdulsalam	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17,18,33,35,37 and 39-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17,18,33,35,37 and 39-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to a communication filed on 3/30/06. Claims 17-18, 33, 35, 37 and 39-52 are pending. Claims 1-16, 19-32, 34, 36 and 38 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited references Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) and Stanek (USPN 5936554) alone or in combination do not teach establishing a set of senders and determining whether a sender of an incoming message is in the set

However, as shown in the art rejection, Kreisel teaches a communications package 3 includes memory containing an incoming queue 23 and an outgoing queue 25 to store messages and/or data files (col. 3, lines 14-26). Kreisel also teaches as shown in Fig. 4 a processing sequence including a status of newly received message (Fig. 4(204)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize message storage as illustrated in computer system of Fig. 1b for the purpose of tracking the status of each message received (col. 3, lines 17-27).

Applicant argues that the cited references Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) does not teach the determining step including whether a request to respond to one of a video conference call and an audio conference call has been received.

However, Kreisel teaches as shown in Fig. 1a a plurality of computer terminals 2 remotely located from one another, with each of the terminals having an electronic communications package 3 or 5 installed (col. 2, lines 62-66).

Art Unit: 2629

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Kreisel's network of multiple terminals (2) shown in Fig. 1a for the purpose of communicating and interacting with one another (col. 2, lines 36-38).

Applicant argues that the cited references, Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) and Pennell (USPN 6874023) alone or in combination do not teach determining whether a user is capable of receiving a solicitation

However, Pennell (USPN 6874023) teaches generation of a unique email address for use in communicating with a web site as illustrated in Fig. 4 where a user receives email from the web site, whether solicited or unsolicited, such that the user is able to discern the sender of the email, as well as control future email correspondence with the web site (col. 1, lines 42-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Pennell's user control with respect to emails as indicated in Fig. 4 because user control over emails helps increase convenience in managing a user's Internet communications as taught by Pennell (col. 1, lines 42-45).

Applicant argues that the cited references, Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) and Macko (USPN 6052563) alone or in combination do not teach determining step, which includes comparing a scheduled event time relative to an actual time set in the computer.

However, as shown in the art rejection below, Macko (USPN 6052563) teaches an email-forwarding program in a PC 130 which is activated at an appropriate time

Art Unit: 2629

corresponding to the scheduled appointment (col. 8, lines 56-67, col. 8, lines 1-4 and Fig. 13 (700)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Macko's email forwarding program (700) as configured in Fig. 13 because an email forwarding program helps automatically forward emails to a communication device (100) as taught by Macko.

Applicant argues that the cited references, Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) and Suzuki et al. (USPN 5890139) alone or in combination do not teach determining step including determining whether a correct answer has been input.

However, as shown in the art rejection below, Suzuki et al. (USPN 5890139) teaches an information answering system in which not-yet-answered case processing unit 160 edits an input answer into the electronic mail format and transfers it to the electronic mail transmission unit 180 (Fig. 5 (109) and col. 7, lines 8-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Suzuki's answer transmission via email (109) as configured in Fig. 5 because the use of answer transmission via email helps function online shopping as taught by Suzuki (col. 1, lines 6-7).

Applicant argues that the cited references, Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) and Gough et al. (USPN 6360221) alone or in combination do not teach the determining step including one of a state, a characteristic, and a condition relating to a character in a game program.

Art Unit: 2629

However, as shown in the art rejection below, Gough et al. (USPN 6360221) teaches an enhanced interactive e-mail system implementing a chess game program, which remembers positions, enforces rules (Fig. 13, col. 15, lines 66-67 and col. 16, lines 1-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Gough's enhanced interactive email driven game as demonstrated in Fig. 13 because the use of enhanced interactive email helps attract users and members to the website as taught by Gough (col. 2, lines 45-49).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Art Unit: 2629

Kreisel's computer system (terminal), (2) shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Stanek's computer program with respect to keyboard illumination as demonstrated in Fig. 8 because the use of a program with respect to keyboard illumination helps establish has a bi-directional communication link between a keyboard and a computer as taught by Stanek (col. 4, lines 62-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Pennell's user control with respect to emails as indicated in Fig. 4 because user control over emails helps increase convenience in managing a user's Internet communications as taught by Pennell (col. 1, lines 42-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Macko's email forwarding program (700) as configured in Fig. 13 because an email forwarding program helps automatically forward emails to a communication device (100) as taught by Macko. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Suzuki's answer transmission via email (109) as configured in Fig. 5 because the use of answer transmission via email helps function online shopping as taught by Suzuki (col. 1, lines 6-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Gough's enhanced interactive email driven game as demonstrated in Fig. 13 because the use of enhanced interactive email helps attract users and members to the website as taught by Gough (col. 2, lines 45-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) in view of Stanek (USPN 5936554).

Regarding claim 35, Kreisel teaches a computer –readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps comprising: (communication package (3) including memory containing incoming queue (23) and outgoing queue (25), col. 3, lines 14-17 and Fig. 1(b)) determining, in a computer, whether a predetermined event has occurred; (Fig. 1(b) and col. 3, lines 18-21, email message) and communicating with a computer input device having an illumination member to cause the illumination member to change in response to the determining step, (inform a user when new mail messages are received by flashing one of the LEDs (17, 21) upon the keyboard (15), col. 8, lines 38-46).

Kreisel does not specifically teach establishing a set of senders and determining whether a sender of an incoming message is in the set.

On the other hand, Kreisel teaches a communications package 3 includes memory containing an incoming queue 23 and an outgoing queue 25 to store messages and/or data files (col. 3, lines 14-26). Kreisel also teaches as shown in Fig. 4 a processing sequence including a status of newly received message (Fig. 4(204)).

Art Unit: 2629

Kreisel does not teach a communicating step includes causing the illumination member to change intensity.

Stanek (USPN 5936554) on the other hand teaches a computer program, whereby a computer 96 instructs a keyboard controller of keyboard 98 via communications link 100 to illuminate particular keys and dim other keys (Fig. 8 (98) and col. 8, lines 14-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's computer system (terminal), (2) shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Stanek's computer program with respect to keyboard illumination as demonstrated in Fig. 8 because the use of a program with respect to keyboard illumination helps establish has a bi-directional communication link between a keyboard and a computer as taught by Stanek (col. 4, lines 62-67).

Regarding claim 49, Kreisel teaches a method for controlling an illumination member on a computer input device (col. 9, lines 18-31) said method comprising determining, in a computer, whether a predetermined event has occurred; (Fig. 1(b) and col. 3, lines 18-21, email message) and changing the state associated with illumination member in response to the determining step (inform a user when new mail messages are received by flashing one of the LEDs (17, 21) upon the keyboard (15), col. 8, lines 38-46).

Kreisel does not specifically teach establishing a set of senders and determining whether a sender of an incoming message is in the set.

On the other hand, Kreisel teaches a communications package 3 includes memory containing an incoming queue 23 and an outgoing queue 25 to store messages and/or data

Art Unit: 2629

files (col. 3, lines 14-26). Kreisel also teaches as shown in Fig. 4 a processing sequence including a status of newly received message (Fig. 4(204)).

Kreisel does not teach changing step includes casing the illumination to change intensity.

Stanek on the other hand teaches a computer program, whereby a computer 96 instructs a keyboard controller of keyboard 98 via communications link 100 to illuminate particular keys and dim other keys (Fig. 8 (98) and col. 8, lines 14-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's computer system (terminal), (2) shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Stanek's computer program with respect to keyboard illumination as demonstrated in Fig. 8 because the use of a program with respect to keyboard illumination helps establish has a bi-directional communication link between a keyboard and a computer as taught by Stanek (col. 4, lines 62-67).

4. Claims 33, 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516).

Regarding claim 37, Kreisel teaches a method for controlling an illumination member on a computer input device (col. 9, lines 18-31) said method comprising determining, in a computer, whether a predetermined event has occurred; (Fig. 1(b) and col. 3, lines 18-21, email message) and changing the state associated with illumination

Art Unit: 2629

member in response to the determining step (inform a user when new mail messages are received by flashing one of the LEDs (17, 21) upon the keyboard (15), col. 8, lines 38-46).

Kreisel does not specifically teach establishing a set of senders and determining whether a sender of an incoming message is in the set.

On the other hand, Kreisel teaches a communications package 3 includes memory containing an incoming queue 23 and an outgoing queue 25 to store messages and/or data files (col. 3, lines 14-26). Kreisel also teaches as shown in Fig. 4 a processing sequence including a status of newly received message (Fig. 4(204)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize message storage as illustrated in computer system of Fig. 1b for the purpose of tracking the status of each message received (col. 3, lines 17-27).

Regarding claim 33, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art mount kreisel's "LED control function" shown in Fig. 2 in any alternative input device since substitution of one type input device by another is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 40, Kreisel teaches a method for controlling an illumination member on a computer input device (col. 9, lines 18-31) said method comprising determining, in a computer, whether a predetermined event has occurred; (Fig. 1(b) and col. 3, lines 18-21, email message) and changing the state associated with illumination member in response to the determining step (inform a user when new mail messages are

Art Unit: 2629

received by flashing one of the LEDs (17, 21) upon the keyboard (15), col. 8, lines 38-46).

Kreisel does not specifically teach whether a request to respond to one of a video conference call and an audio conference call has been received.

Kreisel on the other hand teaches as shown in Fig. 1a a plurality of computer terminals 2 remotely located from one another, with each of the terminals having an electronic communications package 3 or 5 installed (col. 2, lines 62-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize kreisel's network of multiple terminals (2) shown in Fig. 1a for the purpose of communicating and interacting with one another (col. 2, lines 36-38).

5. Claims 41 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) in view of Pennell (USPN 6874023).

Regarding claim 41, Kreisel teaches a method for controlling an illumination member on a computer input device (col. 9, lines 18-31) said method comprising determining, in a computer, whether a predetermined event has occurred; (Fig. 1(b) and col. 3, lines 18-21, email message) and changing the state associated with illumination member in response to the determining step (inform a user when new mail messages are received by flashing one of the LEDs (17, 21) upon the keyboard (15), col. 8, lines 38-46).

Kreisel does not teach whether a user is capable of receiving a solicitation.

Art Unit: 2629

Pennell (USPN 6874023) on the other hand teaches generation of a unique email address for use in communicating with a web site as illustrated in Fig. 4 where a user receives email from the web site, whether solicited or unsolicited, such that the user is able to discern the sender of the email, as well as control future email correspondence with the web site (col. 1, lines 42-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Pennell's user control with respect to emails as indicated in Fig. 4 because user control over emails helps increase convenience in managing a user's Internet communications as taught by Pennell (col. 1, lines 42-45).

Regarding claim 50, Kreisel teaches a method for controlling an illumination member on a computer input device (col. 9, lines 18-31) said method comprising determining, in a computer, whether a predetermined event has occurred; (Fig. 1(b) and col. 3, lines 18-21, email message) and changing the state associated with illumination member in response to the determining step (inform a user when new mail messages are received by flashing one of the LEDs (17, 21) upon the keyboard (15), col. 8, lines 38-46).

Kreisel does not specifically teach a determining step with respect to joining a chat room.

Kreisel on the other hand teaches as shown in Fig. 1a a plurality of computer terminals 2 remotely located from one another, with each of the terminals having an electronic communications package 3 or 5 installed (col. 2, lines 62-66).

Art Unit: 2629

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Kreisel's network of multiple terminals (2) shown in Fig. 1a for the purpose of communicating and interacting with one another (col. 2, lines 36-38).

Kreisel does not teach determining step including whether a request to respond to a solicitation has been received.

Pennell (USPN 6874023) on the other hand teaches generation of a unique email address for use in communicating with a web site as illustrated in Fig. 4 where a user receives email from the web site, whether solicited or unsolicited, such that the user is able to discern the sender of the email, as well as control future email correspondence with the web site (col. 1, lines 42-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Pennell's user control with respect to emails as indicated in Fig. 4 because user control over emails helps increase convenience in managing a user's Internet communications as taught by Pennell (col. 1, lines 42-45).

6. Claims 42 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) in view of Macko (USPN 6052563).

Regarding claim 42, Kreisel teaches a method for controlling an illumination member on a computer input device (col. 9, lines 18-31) said method comprising determining, in a computer, whether a predetermined event has occurred; (Fig. 1(b) and

Art Unit: 2629

col. 3, lines 18-21, email message) and changing the state associated with illumination member in response to the determining step (inform a user when new mail messages are received by flashing one of the LEDs (17, 21) upon the keyboard (15), col. 8, lines 38-46).

Kreisel does not teach comparing a scheduled event time relative to an actual time set in the computer.

Macko (USPN 6052563) on the other hand teaches an email-forwarding program in a PC 130 which is activated at an appropriate time corresponding to the scheduled appointment (col. 8, lines 56-67, col. 8, lines 1-4 and Fig. 13 (700)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Macko's email forwarding program (700) as configured in Fig. 13 because an email forwarding program helps automatically forward emails to a communication device (100) as taught by Macko.

Regarding claim 17, Macko teaches said determining step includes determining whether the actual time set in the computer is the same as the scheduled event time (col. 8, lines 56-67, col. 8, lines 1-4 and Fig. 13 (700)).

Regarding claim 18, Macko teaches said determining step includes determining whether the actual time set in the computer has reached a time prior to the scheduled event time (col. 8, lines 56-67, col. 8, lines 1-4 and Fig. 13 (700)).

7. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) in view of Suzuki et al. (USPN 5890139).

Regarding claim 43, Kreisel teaches a method for controlling an illumination member on a computer input device (col. 9, lines 18-31) said method comprising determining, in a computer, whether a predetermined event has occurred; (Fig. 1(b) and col. 3, lines 18-21, email message) and changing the state associated with illumination member in response to the determining step (inform a user when new mail messages are received by flashing one of the LEDs (17, 21) upon the keyboard (15), col. 8, lines 38-46).

Kreisel does not teach determining whether a correct answer has been input.

Suzuki et al. (USPN 5890139) on the other hand teaches an information answering system in which not-yet-answered case processing unit 160 edits an input answer into the electronic mail format and transfers it to the electronic mail transmission unit 180 (Fig. 5 (109) and col. 7, lines 8-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Suzuki's answer transmission via email (109) as configured in Fig. 5 because the use of answer transmission via email helps function online shopping as taught by Suzuki (col. 1, lines 6-7).

8. Claims 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516) in view of Gough et al. (USPN 6360221).

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 44, Kreisel teaches a method for controlling an illumination member on a computer input device (col. 9, lines 18-31) said method comprising determining, in a computer, whether a predetermined event has occurred; (Fig. 1(b) and col. 3, lines 18-21, email message) and changing the state associated with illumination member in response to the determining step (inform a user when new mail messages are received by flashing one of the LEDs (17, 21) upon the keyboard (15), col. 8, lines 38-46).

Kreisel does not teach the determining step including one of a state, a characteristic, and a condition relating to a character in a game program.

Gough et al. (USPN 6360221) on the other hand teaches an enhanced interactive e-mail system implementing a chess game program, which remembers positions, enforces rules (Fig. 13, col. 15, lines 66-67 and col. 16, lines 1-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kreisel's email communication shown in Fig. 1b to adapt Gough's enhanced interactive email driven game as demonstrated in Fig. 13 because the use of enhanced interactive email helps attract users and members to the website as taught by Gough (col. 2, lines 45-49).

Regarding claim 45, Gough teaches said determining step includes determining whether the character is within a given proximity of an object (col. 15, lines 66-67 and col. 16, lines 1-13, enhanced e-mail implements a chess game program which remembers positions, enforces rules etc. It would have been obvious to utilize Kreisel's email-based flashing with respect Gough's email-based chess game program).

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 46, Gough teaches said changing step includes the illumination member to change states in a manner corresponding to a number of lives remaining for the character (col. 15, lines 66-67 and col. 16, lines 1-13, enhanced e-mail implements a chess game program which remembers positions, enforces rules etc. For one of ordinary skill, it would be obvious to reprogram Gough's chess game for additional functionalities. It would also have been obvious to utilize Kreisel's email- based flashing with respect Gough's email-based chess game program).

Regarding claim 47, Gough teaches said changing step includes causing the illumination member to change states in a manner corresponding to an amount of supply for the character (col. 15, lines 66-67 and col. 16, lines 1-13, enhanced e-mail implements a chess game program which remembers positions, enforces rules etc. For one of ordinary skill, it would be obvious to reprogram Gough's chess game for additional functionalities. It would also have been obvious to utilize Kreisel's email- based flashing with respect Gough's email-based chess game program).

Regarding claim 48, Gough teaches said changing step includes casing the illumination member to change states in a manner corresponding to the character entering an area in the game program (col. 15, lines 66-67 and col. 16, lines 1-13, enhanced e-mail implements a chess game program which remembers positions, enforces rules etc. For one of ordinary skill, it would be obvious to reprogram Gough's chess game for additional functionalities. It would also have been obvious to utilize Kreisel's email-based flashing with respect Gough's email-based chess game program).

Art Unit: 2629

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 39 and 51-52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kreisel et al. (USPN 6088516).

Regarding claims 39 and 52, Kreisel teaches a method for controlling an illumination member on a computer input device (col. 9, lines 18-31) said method comprising determining, in a computer, whether a predetermined event has occurred; (Fig. 1(b) and col. 3, lines 18-21, email message) and changing the state associated with illumination member in response to the determining step (inform a user when new mail messages are received by flashing one of the LEDs (17, 21) upon the keyboard (15), col. 8, lines 38-46), wherein said determining step includes determining step includes determining whether an instant message has been received (Fig. 2(202) and col. 8, lines 65, flag identifying incoming mail) and determining whether an email message has been received (Fig. 2 (404), evaluates the state of Flag (true or false), col. 8, lines 66) wherein said changing step includes changing the state associated with the illumination member to a first state in response to determining an instant message has been received (col. 8, lines 66-67, if the mail flag is false, no mail has been received) and changing the state associated with the illumination member to a second state in response to determining an

Art Unit: 2629

email message has been received (col. 9, lines 2-10, if mail flag is true, if LED is ON, it turns OFF, if LED is already OFF, it turns ON).

Regarding claim 51, the first state and the second state are different states (col. 9, lines 2-10).

In addition, with respect to claim 52, note that Kriesel teaches that the Scroll Lock LED may be controlled to flash at a given rate regardless of the number of new message (col. 9, lines 10-21).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abbas I. Abdulselem whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 2629

272-7685. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abbas Abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2629

June 9, 2006



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600